



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,389	01/16/2002	Kenneth A. Berger	014600-0003 (B69393)	1678
20594	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, LLP			RUTTEN, JAMES D	
P O BOX 688			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 75313-0688			2122	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/046,389

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

J. Derek Rutten

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

#### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant's preliminary amendment filed on 10/1/2002 regarding paragraph [0001] makes reference to "U.S. Patent 09/689,067", which should instead be --U.S. Patent Application 09/689,067-- since it refers to an application number and has not yet issued as a patent. Also, reference to "U.S. Patent No. 09/631,469" should instead be --U.S. Patent No. 6,553,406--, since the original application issued on 04/22/2003.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: As a result of a typo, there is a period at the end of line 9 where there should be a comma. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2122

5. Claims 1-7 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 1 contains the phrase “by an operator” in line 6. It is not clear if the word operator is referring to a user of the system, or if it refers to an operator of the code that links the two features in some way (e.g. the ‘+’ operator in ‘5+2’). For the purpose of further examination, this will be interpreted to refer to --a user of the system--.
7. Claims 2-7 are rejected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim.
8. Claim 15 contains the phrase “one or more of the classes” in lines 8 and 9, and 10 and 11. It is not clear whether this refers to “one or more classes” recited in line 3, “developer classes” recited in line 7, or both. For the purpose of further examination, this will be interpreted as --said one or more classes--.
9. Claims 16-20 are rejected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

11. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0037490 A1 by Chiang (hereinafter “Chiang”).

In regard to claim 1, Chiang discloses:

*A system for generating user interface code (See FIG. 2) comprising:*

*a user interface class system generating user interface class code, wherein the user interface class code includes two more user interface features that can be assembled user interface by an operator; See page 3, paragraph [0026] along with FIG. 2, element 205: Web Application Generator”; also paragraph [0035] and FIG. 4 element 405: “Graphical User Interfaces”.*

*handler class system generating handler class code, wherein the handler class code includes one or more states for each user interface feature of the user interface class. See page 3 paragraph [0026] and FIG. 2 as cited above; also paragraph [0035] and FIG. 4 element 415: “Event Handler”.*

*wherein the user interface class and the handler class cause the selected user interface features and associated states for the user interface features be generated when the user interface code is executed. See page 2 paragraph [0011]:*

Also, modifications to the input files that make up the graphical user interface are automatically re-compiled or re-interpreted at runtime without affecting the parallel work of the web developers.

In regard to claim 2, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Chiang further discloses a developer user interface class system. See FIG. 2 element 210 and FIG. 4 element 405.

In regard to claim 3, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Chiang further discloses a developer handler class system. See FIG. 2 element 215 and FIG. 4 element 415.

In regard to claim 6, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Chiang further discloses a report user interface class on page 7 paragraph [0097].

In regard to claim 7, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Chiang further discloses a report handler class on page 7 paragraph [0098].

In regard to claim 8, Chiang discloses:

*A method for generating user interface code comprising:*

*receiving a selection of a user interface feature from a user interface class; See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

Modified **input files may then be received** by the web application server from the graphic designers or business analysts, and the modified input files are compiled and dynamically bound with the compiled web application source code at runtime.

*retrieving a handler associated with the user interface feature that includes one or more states; See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

Further, based on work by web developers, the web application server **receives** web application business logic objects and **event handlers** from the web developers, and organizes the application framework code, web application business logic objects and event handler methods into web application source code.

*generating one or more code elements that cause a user display to be generated when executed that includes the user interface feature having the one or more states. See paragraph [0010] starting on page 1:*

In accordance with one embodiment of the web application generator, there is provided a method of **generating computer code** for a web application, and dynamically binding input files from graphic designers and source code from web developers, comprising the web application server receiving input files from graphic designers or business analysts, wherein the input files are at least one web application **graphical user interface**.

In regard to claim 9 and 10, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 2 and 3, respectively.

In regard to claim 13 and 14, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 6 and 7, respectively.

In regard to claim 15, Chiang discloses:

*A system for generating software code comprising:*

*a primary code generator receiving one or more user selections from one or more classes and generating primary software code; See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

The web application server determines if an application framework code is available for the web application, and **retrieves the application framework code** from an application directory.

Note that the primary code generator is inherently present due to the existence of the application framework code. If there was no code generator present, the framework code could not exist.

*a developer code generator receiving the primary software code and one or more user selections from one or more developer classes and generating developer software code; See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

Further, based on work by web developers, the web application server receives web application business logic objects and event handlers from the web developers, and **organizes the application framework code, web application business logic objects and event handler methods into web application source code.**

*primary code editor modifying said one or more of the classes; See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

**Modified input files** may then be received by the web application server from the graphic designers or business analysts, and the modified input files are compiled and dynamically bound with the compiled web application source code at runtime.

An editor is inherently required in order to modify the input files.

*wherein the modifications made to said one or more classes by the primary code editor result in the generation of code that is compatible with the developer software code. See page 2 paragraph [0010]:*

...modified input files are **compiled and dynamically bound** with the compiled web application source code at runtime.

Compatibility is inherently required for compilation and dynamic binding.



In regard to claim 17, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 1 and 8.

In regard to claim 18, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 2 and 3.

In regard to claim 20, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 1 and 8.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang.

In regard to claim 4, the above rejection of claim 2 is incorporated. Chiang further discloses general modification of a user interface and customization for specific user sites (See page 2 paragraph [0011]: “modifications” ). Chiang discloses a primary class and a developer class as cited in the above rejections of claims 1 and 2. Chiang does not expressly disclose a third “site-specific” user interface. However, Chiang

discloses modification and dynamic binding of modified code in order for a user interface to be customized (See page 2 paragraph [0010]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reiterate the process of modification in order to provide a third level customization of a user interface. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to update and modify an interface to provide versatile system that would provide a full and complete higher levels of detail as needed for customizing web applications.

In regard to claim 5, the above rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Chiang discloses a handler class as cited in the above rejection of claim 3. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 4.

In regard to claim 11 and 12, the above rejection of claims 8 and 9 are incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 4 and 5, respectively.

In regard to claim 16, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 4 and 5.

In regard to claim 19, the above rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Art Unit: 2122

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (571) 272-3703. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, Th, F 6:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jdr



**TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**